

**MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

September 17, 2003
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Neil Giuliano, Tempe, Chair
Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale, Vice Chair
Benito Almanza, Bank of America Arizona
F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation
Oversight Committee
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert
Dave Berry, Swift Transportation
Jed S. Billings, FNF Construction
Councilmember Peggy Bilsten, Phoenix
Mayor James Cavanaugh, Goodyear
Councilmember Pat Dennis, Peoria
Mayor Ron Drake, Avondale

Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler
Rusty Gant, ADOT
Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa
Eneas Kane, DMB Associates
Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale
Mayor Lon McDermott, Wickenburg
Diane Scherer, Phoenix Association of Realtors
Vice Mayor Daniel Schweiker, Paradise Valley
Martin Shultz, Pinnacle West Capital Corp.
Supervisor Don Stapley, Maricopa County
Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas, Litchfield Park

* Not present

#Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call

1. **Call to Order**

The meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee was called to order by Chairman Neil Giuliano at 2:05 p.m.

2. **Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chairman Giuliano announced that transit tickets were available for those who used transit to come to the meeting. Validation was available from MAG staff for those who parked in the parking garage. He requested that audience conversations be kept to a minimum during the meeting due to the room's acoustics. He announced that materials were at each place: Revised minutes for July 2, July 16 and July 22, 2003; letters received from member agencies and the public since mailing the agenda; Policy Concepts for Consideration; the Final Draft Stage of Member Agency Comments; a revised TPC Timeline; a description of dust control measures that will be used in the air quality conformity analysis for the Regional Transportation Plan.

Chairman Giuliano stated that this is an historic day for the region and the Transportation Policy Committee and is an exciting milestone for transportation. Chairman Giuliano recounted how the TPC worked with the rural and urban cities and towns to deliberate if the half cent sales tax would be a

statewide tax; it was determined that it would be a Maricopa County only tax. The TPC worked with the business community and the County to resolve the return to sender issue. The TPC worked with the business community, cities and towns, and the legislature on HB 2292. Chairman Giuliano recognized the work of the legislators and expressed his appreciation for their efforts. He stated that recently, some of the TPC had the opportunity to tour transportation projects in the peer city of Dallas, Texas, and found out that Dallas will be embarking on a process similar to the cooperative efforts of MAG with the State and County. Chairman Giuliano stated that the TPC, Maricopa County, RPTA, and ADOT conducted the most inclusionary effort in the history of MAG, which could be a model for other issues that affect the region. He stated there is much work still to be accomplished before sending the plan to the voters. Chairman Giuliano stated that the air quality conformity analysis will need to meet an aggressive schedule. After the analysis is done, the plan needs to be certified to the Governor and Legislature by November 30th. The next step is that the Legislature needs to take action in January to authorize an election so that the elections department can get the ballot language provided by the Board of Supervisors by February 3rd. Chairman Giuliano paraphrased from the minutes of the September 2002 TPC Retreat: "The Committee needs to stay the course and follow a very aggressive schedule. A plan with solutions is needed with the understanding that not all will agree with everything, but all will get something."

Chairman Giuliano explained an outline of the meeting. For agenda item #5C, individual votes would be taken on projects, phasing, and policies—the three "P's." After those three votes are taken, the TPC will vote on the entire plan that incorporates the action on the three P's. Chairman Giuliano explained that following the vote on #5C, the TPC would then vote on moving forward the plan for an air quality conformity analysis. He expressed his thanks to everyone for their work and dedication throughout the process.

3. Call to the Audience

Chairman Giuliano stated that an opportunity is available to members of the public to offer public comment. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Mayor Skip Rimsza, Phoenix. Mayor Rimsza stated that today, the federal government authorized a five month extension of TEA-21 funding for transportation in the nation. He stated that the TPC recognized that work needed to begin early on the extension of the half cent sales tax for transportation before the existing tax expired in 2006. MAG and the business community said this was something that needed to be addressed so there would be continuous funding for transportation in the region. Mayor Rimsza stated that everyone should feel good about what has been accomplished. Efforts such as this are not done in other parts of the country. Mayor Rimsza stated that the TPC is planning for future investments to build for the future. He commented that everyone had challenges to meet the needs of their individual communities, and the TPC should feel good about what has been accomplished. Mayor Rimsza stated that the journey began a few years back while he was Chair of the Regional Council. He stated that bringing in the business community contributed to the powerful foundation work. Voters will respond and the election will win. The win will allow protection of the region's quality of life. Mayor Rimsza stated that the region has benefitted by decisions of past leaders, on such projects as CAP and SRP. In 1985, leaders advanced the half cent sales tax for transportation. This region would be choking in its own traffic if the decision for the sales tax had not been made in 1985. Mayor Rimsza expressed his congratulations and thanks for the years of support given to him and the good work for the region. The results of the plan will be positive. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mayor Rimsza for his comments. He expressed his thanks to

Mayor Rimsza for his leadership and involvement in the many issues in the Valley and his help and support.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Ben Kugler, who stated that the TPC efforts have been beneficial because it is a cooperative effort. He stated that he represents the Manzanita Block Watch, which represents approximately 70,000 residents. Mr. Kugler expressed concern for the double-deck design on I-17. He stated that his group is generally in favor, but have some qualifications—that it be below-ground, xeriscaped, and have mass transit hubs. Mr. Kugler stated that the group requests that they be involved in the process. He added that the group also wants to be involved in the decision making process for the light rail lines planned for the west side of I-17 from Dunlap to Northern. Mr. Kugler stated that he would like to encourage the TPC in actively involving neighborhoods and businesses in the area. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Kugler for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Kenneth Grise. Mr. Grise was not present.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Dianne Barker, who requested that staff provide her with a response if officials can comment during Call to the Audience or be put on the agenda. Ms. Barker stated that citizens are disallowed to attend executive sessions and certain meetings. Ms. Barker noted comments turned in by citizens reflect that the plan should not cater to pet projects, should be regional, and wean drivers from their dependence on automobiles. She stated that another citizen said that the lower income residents will be paying proportionately more sales tax than other residents and receiving less. Ms. Barker expressed concern that the plan does not address pedestrian safety. She stated that all monies coming in, including funds going to cities, should be considered in the total amount available for transportation. Ms. Barker stated that Grand Avenue and the canals should be considered so that the region could have the fastest rail possible. Chairman Giuliano thanked Ms. Barker for her comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Ron Friesen, Chair of Black Canyon CLOUT, which represents 35 groups, bounded by I-17 to 43rd Avenue, Indian School Road to Dunlap Avenue. Mr. Friesen expressed that CLOUT supports the RTP, including the double-deck on I-17, and the extension of the half cent sales tax for transportation for 20 years. He requested that the group would like to see a recommendation to establish community advisory boards to be involved in the design and construction of such projects as the I-17 double-deck. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Friesen for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Bob McKnight, who commented that a Phoenix news release states an increase in transit ridership of five million, or 11.56 percent, over the past year. Mr. McKnight stated that this should say boardings. If the numbers were accurate, there would be 43 million riders. Mr. McKnight stated that this loose language is typical of the process and is propaganda. He stated that you ignore the facts, are arrogant, and we end up paying the bill. Mr. McKnight stated that he went to Vancouver, which has been named as having the best transit system in North America. He stated that he had never heard of their system, and then realized it was because they had ripped up the rails and put in electric trolley buses. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. McKnight for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Blue Crowley, who referred members to the documentation page of the Input Opportunity Report. Mr. Crowley stated that the minutes express his feelings about 51st Avenue. He stated that the County's plan needs to be considered. Mr. Crowley stated that a one cent sales tax is needed, not a half cent. He added that he wanted the tax split one-third

to light rail/freeways, one-third to rubber tire transit, and one-third to roadways. Mr. Crowley stated that the roadways are being shortchanged. He stated that he liked the input from agencies, but he heard from citizens that they want more transit and rubber tire transit. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Beverly Harvey, who stated that she was an organizer for Black Canyon CLOUT, an organization representing 35 groups, bounded by I-17 to 43rd Avenue, Indian School Road to Dunlap Avenue and also represented the United Neighbors Association. Ms. Harvey expressed that both organizations support the RTP, including the double-deck on I-17, and the extension of the half cent sales tax for to provide infrastructure for transporting people. Ms. Harvey stated that people along the double-deck area are concerned to the extent that their concerns could jeopardize support. She stated that this concerns the organizations greatly. Ms. Harvey requested that the TPC recommend to the legislature establishing community advisory boards to be involved in the design and construction of such projects as the I-17 double-deck. Ms. Harvey stated that this would assure the residents they have a voice in the design and they could feel comfortable supporting the proposal. Chairman Giuliano thanked Ms. Harvey for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Kenneth Grise. Mr. Grise was not present.

4. Approval of July 2, 2003, July 16, 2003, and July 22, 2003 Meeting Minutes

Mayor Drake moved to approve the revised July 2, 2003, July 16, 2003, and July 22, 2003 meeting minutes. Mayor Cavanaugh seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

5A. Review of Comments From Public Involvement Efforts

Kelly Taft gave a presentation on the extensive public involvement efforts undertaken in the development of the Regional Transportation Plan. Ms. Taft stated that the outreach included more than 150 early input opportunities and involved thousands of citizens, including special events, public workshops, the Regional Town Hall, Web opportunities, and small group presentations. She noted that after the draft plan was approved on July 22nd, the draft plan was taken back to the public for further review and comment. Ms. Taft stated that comment was received at six public meetings and six business hearings. In addition, other input opportunities included presentations to small group, and input received online, by telephone and US mail. Ms. Taft reviewed the results from the public input form that was distributed at public meetings and special events: 97 percent of participants agreed that there is a significant problem with transportation; awareness of the sales tax expiration was very high among public meeting participants; in nearly every venue, the majority of participants agreed with the level of investment allocated to each mode in the draft plan. Ms. Taft stated that many participants expressed concern for neighborhood mitigation issues, and a desire for safety considerations. They expressed support for mass transit improvements and freeway investments. She noted that the strongest differences of opinions were in freeways and light rail, with both strong support and opposition shown for each.

Chairman Giuliano thanked staff for the extensive public outreach over a sustained period of time. He asked if there were questions.

Mayor Thomas asked if commuter rail had come up at public meetings. Ms. Taft replied that commuter rail was mentioned a number of times. She added that commuter rail was not listed on the input form, but comments were unsolicited.

5B. Review of Transportation Survey Results

Earl DeBerge, Behavior Research, gave a presentation on a public survey that was conducted in August 2003. He explained how a telephone poll of 600 registered voters indicates that 75 percent of Maricopa County voters would support the extension of the current half-cent sales tax for transportation, if the election were held today. Mr. DeBerge indicated there was strong support within all geographic areas of the Valley. The poll also found that awareness of the expiration of the half-cent sales tax for transportation has risen since a similar poll was conducted in December, from 27 percent to 31 percent. Mr. DeBerge explained that voters were also asked to rate their overall transportation spending priorities. Freeway, major street improvements and bus service were the highest-rated priorities, with six to seven in ten giving each a high priority. Light rail and Dial-a-Ride services received high priority ratings from 45 percent and 39 percent, respectively, while another fifth to a third rated each as moderate priorities. Mr. DeBerge stated that voters also showed support for regional improvements, with 89 percent reporting that they favor a transportation system that improves how people get around the entire Valley, and only nine percent favoring one that improves how people get around their area of the Valley. Mr. DeBerge stated that when respondents were asked the likelihood of utilizing various transportation modes in the future, 94 percent of respondents indicated they or a member of their family would use freeways, 55 percent indicated they would use light rail, 49 percent bus service, and 25 percent Dial-a-Ride. Even when presented with arguments both for and against individual transportation modes, support for the tax extension remained high. Mr. DeBerge stated that the primary reasons voters gave for supporting the sales tax extension were that the overall transportation system in the Valley needs to be improved or kept current, improvements are needed to keep up with Valley growth, there is a need for more or updated freeways, and there is a need to reduce traffic congestion. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. DeBerge for his presentation.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Jane White, who stated that the only creative thinking that has been done is at the County level. They come up with good ideas, otherwise, it is the same old thing. Ms. White stated that they defeated the 1994 tax because MAG was not accountable. The County has come up with a creative idea to include accountability. Why would anyone object to a five-year review? Ms. White stated that she opposed the plan. If the plan passes, it is essential that assurances of a review are included. Chairman Giuliano thanked Ms. White for her comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Jim Patterson, Co-Chair of the East Valley Transportation Commission. Mr. Patterson acknowledged the tremendous amount of work done by the TPC. He stated that he appreciated the great effort. Mr. Patterson stated that his group strongly supports the extension of the half cent sales tax. He added that he wished it could be for a larger amount. On a regional basis they feel there ought to be more consideration of the Price Road corridor and connecting it to I-10. Mr. Patterson stated that the Hunt Highway corridor should have right-of-way protection, which is extremely important for the East Valley and Northern Pinal County. He added that this area will be a future economic generator. Mr. Patterson stated that he feels that the accountability provision is extremely positive and beneficial, and a concept that he thinks the voters would like to see. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Patterson for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Steve Dreiseszun, represent the F.Q. Story Historic District in Central Phoenix. He stated that for many months, he has appeared before this body and others attempting to convey the problems that impact neighborhoods such as his that border the various rights of way in the Valley. Mr. Dreiseszun stated that Interstate 10 bisects the FQ Story neighborhood, essentially cutting it in half. He stated that he has presented information demonstrating the extremely high traffic volumes, excessive noise levels at or above State and Federal standards, the lack of effective noise barriers, poor air quality and heavy truck traffic that roars through the Story neighborhood at all hours, day and night - all to apparently no avail. Mr. Dreiseszun stated that the document being considered today is the result of a tremendous amount of effort from professionals, agencies, planners, community and business leaders. The Plan is extensive and it is staggering. But there is a problem.-- there are no allocations made for neighborhood mitigation of the very rights of way of which we are so fervent. We have a vicious circle. People who want to avoid the negative impact of a freeway, move to outlying areas for quality of life. Then they expect to have an expressway route that will take them where ever they want to go. When the transportation infrastructure intrudes on them, they complain that they've lost their peace and quiet and move further away, with the same expectations of travel convenience. It never ends. Mr. Dreiseszun commented that to reduce this escapist sprawl, we need to provide mitigation to those residents on these rights of way and maintain a quality of life that attracts. He commented that he feels that there is genuine concern for these issues from this Committee. The differences are how and when do we deal with them? There are many competing interests for every dollar in this Plan. Some look at the projected surplus and want to revisit projects dropped earlier. Some have said that we should wait and see what's available as long range projections are unreliable. Some have said that we couldn't focus on neighborhood mitigation when there was an \$800 million shortfall. Whether the Plan is short \$800 million or will end up with a \$94 million surplus is not the point as this Plan and its process, so far, shortchanges neighborhoods. Mitigation has been an after thought when it should be policy and a major design requisite. It should be a first priority not a last. This is a regional issue that affects all communities. Neighborhoods must be viewed as a collective concern, not a patch of houses here and there along these rights of way. If we wait until the end of the Plan, then some neighborhoods will be asked to wait for 30 or 40 years for relief. Why should a transportation system run over its citizens? The greater good is not good enough when neighborhoods pay an undue price for progress. Staff has again recommended inclusion of this mitigation budget allocation. There are contingencies throughout the Plan for all of the other major components. We must have a neighborhood mitigation contingency as well that will allow some restoration of our quality of life. You must all be Solomon here. While hard choices must be made today, this one is not so hard. Show the residents of the County that their quality of life is as important as their quality of commute. This must been done today, not 20 years from now. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Dreiseszun for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley, who stated that he had a problem with the 60/30/10 division. He noted that the 30 part is supposedly for transit; however, he thinks of transit as rubber tire. Mr. Crowley commented that of the 27 miles of light rail, 23 miles are within the City of Phoenix, with 12 miles above ground. He noted that ADOT has said that overground and underground multiplies the cost. Mr. Crowley stated the improvements on SR 51 will be done in separate phases. He stated that Phoenix did not split the vote so you could see if the vote was for light rail or rubber tire transit. Mr. Crowley stated that Phoenix wants to start I-17 and SR 51 improvements, but they have not finished the I-10 express terminal. He stated that the Phoenix Commission decides the stops and has not considered this, nor major employers such as Viad. Mr. Crowley stated that they are now doing an \$80,000 study on this. He stated that the backbone of transportation is roads, and nine percent is insufficient. Mr. Crowley expressed his thanks to Vice Chair Scruggs for fighting for the

rights of the East and West Valleys and not just Phoenix. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

5C. Review of Comments From the Arizona Department of Transportation, the Regional Public Transportation Authority, Maricopa County, Indian Communities, MAG Member Agencies and the Legislature Regarding the Final Draft Stage of the Plan and Presentation by Maricopa County

Chairman Giuliano stated that at the July 22nd meeting, the TPC approved supporting the hybrid plan as presented with no local match on transit, including the South Mountain as a freeway, an additional amount of \$500 million for the I-17 freeway, and the I-10 Reliever as a freeway; to assume savings from value engineering on all modes; to apply performance standards on all projects; and to move forward with the public hearings. He noted that this is consistent with HB 2292 and gave direction to MAG staff to circulate the draft for comment. According to the law, the TPC has to systematically consider the comments and any plan modification proposals submitted by the Arizona Department of Transportation, the Regional Public Transportation Authority, Maricopa County, MAG member agencies and the Legislature regarding the final draft stage of the Plan, then approve, disapprove or further modify each proposed plan modification that has been submitted by those agencies. Chairman Giuliano stated that discussion was needed on modifications received. Eric Anderson provided an overview of revenue adjustments subsequent to the July 22nd meeting. Chairman Giuliano asked if there were questions on revenue issues.

Mayor Thomas asked if there was a breakdown of the \$789 million. Mr. Anderson replied that in terms of funding, we have a pot of money that is applied across all the projects. There is a list of projects funded by that, but not a specific list comprising the \$789 million.

Mr. Shultz asked for clarification that the bottom line balance was \$94 million after the changes just described were calculated. Mr. Anderson confirmed that was correct. Mr. Shultz asked Mr. Anderson to describe the difference in the \$1.7 billion contingency variation between capacity and bus light rail and other programs. Mr. Anderson stated that different levels of contingency were assigned; for example, the arterials mode was assigned a 15 percent contingency, bus operations and maintenance were assigned a three percent contingency. Mr. Anderson stated that contingency funds are specific for the types of projects in the Plan. Contingencies are varied across projects even within modes. Mr. Shultz asked for confirmation that the overall contingency total was 12 percent. Mr. Anderson confirmed that was correct.

Chairman Giuliano reviewed the table. He suggested a motion on each of the 3 P's, followed by one vote yes or no on the entire Plan. If the Plan is approved, for item #6, the TPC would then consider moving the plan forward for an air quality conformity analysis. He stated that the projects received from the East Valley and noted in the Final Draft Stage Summary of Member Agency Comments would be addressed first.

Mayor Thomas asked if the July 22nd Plan would be kept intact, or if each project would be revisited. Chairman Giuliano replied that according to HB 2292, the TPC is obligated to consider requested modifications by member agencies, ADOT, RPTA, and the County. He noted that the requested modifications were displayed with shading on the table. Chairman Giuliano stated that the TPC can approve, modify, or disapprove the requests.

Mayor Thomas stated that he would like to make a motion. He stated that in the interest of the work over the last year, the TPC is obligated to consider the modifications; however, look at the successes on the Plan to date—Rusty Bowers, *The Arizona Republic*, Mayor Skip Rimsza, the Input Opportunity Report, the survey—all made positive remarks on the successes. Mayor Thomas moved to accept the July 22nd Plan as a basis of discussion from this point forward, with the \$94 million surplus available to use for the plan modifications. Councilmember Dennis seconded.

Chairman Giuliano asked for clarification of the motion. Mayor Thomas explained that his motion is saying to preserve the July 22nd plan, take the \$94 million and consider modifications from this point forward. He added that with a different amount of money, we have a different set of outcomes.

Chairman Giuliano called for a vote on the question, which failed by a vote of six yes, and 15 no.

Mayor Hawker explained the projects noted in Chairman Giuliano's correspondence dated September 12, 2003 and in the Final Draft Stage Summary of Member Agency Comments. He stated that the projects were listed on page nine, items one through four, City of Chandler, page 11, items one through 11, Town of Gilbert; page 15, items one through 13, City of Mesa; page 17, items one through four, City of Scottsdale; and page 19, item one, City of Surprise.

Mr. Shultz asked if the intent was to put the projects on the table for a vote. Chairman Giuliano replied that was the intent—to resolve this issue before moving on.

Mayor Hawker moved to add the following projects to the draft final Regional Transportation Plan: page nine, items one through four, City of Chandler, page 11, items one through 11, Town of Gilbert; page 15, items one through 13, City of Mesa; page 17, items one through four, City of Scottsdale; page 19, item one, City of Surprise, for approximately \$306 million, as shown in the Final Draft Stage Summary of Member Agency Comments. Mayor Berman seconded.

Chairman Giuliano suggested a break before the TPC continued discussion of matters before them.

Mr. Kane made a substitute motion to add the following: SR 74, US 60, Loop 303 right-of-way preservation (SR 74 from Loop 303 to US 60); Loop 303 right-of-way preservation south of the river (MC 85), for an estimated cost of \$100 million. In addition, within the City of Phoenix, additional traffic interchanges deleted in an earlier discussion in the approximate amount of \$74 million.

Mr. Smith clarified that the \$74 million meant 100 percent funding for new interchanges valleywide. Mr. Kane replied that he was responding to the City of Phoenix request and understood that the \$74 million was for valleywide interchanges.

Mr. Kane stated that in addition, the TPC has not yet agreed to use some of the contingency as stated in the draft plan. He commented that the additions would reduce the total contingency to about 9.2 percent overall.

Mr. Berry seconded Mr. Kane's substitute motion.

Councilmember Bilsten commented that since there are many pieces to the motion, could votes be taken separately on each? She commented that it would be a shame to vote all down if there was disagreement on just one or two.

Ms. Scherer moved to bifurcate the motion. Councilmember Bilsten seconded. Chairman Giuliano called for a vote, which failed by a vote of six yes and 15 no.

Mr. Shultz commented that the substitute motion would include the projects stated and it also says that the contingency would change, but to an allowable percentage, which is in the eight to ten percent range, according to transportation professionals. Mr. Shultz stated that he would like to show where the TPC is today. He commented that he has been both frustrated and pleased with the strength of local governments' abilities to advance their thoughts and projects for their constituents. As Mayor Rimsza said, "Look how far we've come." Mr. Shultz stated that the TPC is not at the point where they are respecting the legitimate prerogative of Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa, Scottsdale and Surprise and the legitimate prerogative of other cities. Mr. Shultz stated that when he came into the meeting today, his evaluation was that freeways and transit programs were good, but the streets needed to be strengthened. He stated that the motion does that. Mr. Shultz stated that it is time now for elected officials and the business community to do what they said they were going to do, and approve a regional plan. He commented that the motion strengthens streets, is fundable, and strengthens the comprehensive transportation program. Mr. Shultz advocated that the TPC move forward. He stated that he would like to have a unanimous vote, or close to unanimous as possible.

Supervisor Stapley asked for clarification of the total amount being added by the substitute motion. Mr. Kane replied that the total is \$480 million, of which is the \$94 million is the available balance and \$386 million from contingency. Supervisor Stapley commented that this definitely falls within the County's critique of the plan. He stated that the County felt the streets program was underfunded. Supervisor Stapley stated that the substitute motion made sense, as long as it falls within the contingency range.

Mayor Cavanaugh asked for clarification that the substitute motion incorporated the provisions of the original motion. Chairman Giuliano replied that it did, and then adds to it.

Mayor Dunn asked for clarification if there would still be a vote on the original motion if the substitute motion failed. Chairman Giuliano replied that was correct.

Councilmember Bilsten asked for assurance that there would be sufficient funds in place for mitigation efforts. Mr. Smith replied that rubberized asphalt is included in the policy concepts to be discussed later. The fund includes \$75 million for rubberized asphalt. He added that mitigation would come out of the \$354 maintenance amount. Councilmember Bilsten asked if a calculation had been done to provide walls and rubberized asphalt where mitigation is needed, and landscaping on all freeways. Mr. Smith replied that all new freeway construction will have rubberized asphalt. He added that ADOT has a plan for rubberized asphalt beyond what has been agreed to between MAG and ADOT. Mr. Smith stated that we are at zero regional funding now for maintenance, and are taking that to \$354 million. Councilmember Bilsten stated that it is important to her that neighborhoods are taken care of. She stated that she wanted to ensure there is sufficient funding. Mr. Anderson stated that staff thinks that will be an adequate amount because the widening projects will include rubberized asphalt and mitigation. He added that the \$75 million is intended for areas not slated for improvements in the plan period, for example, the FQ Story Historic District. Mr. Anderson further explained that overall contingencies are built into the direct budget costs. In addition, another layer of contingency is added on top of that, so we have protected ourselves. Overall, the contingency funds would represent about 9.3 percent of the Plan after the adjustments are made.

Mayor Hawker asked if the right-of-way existed already for SR 74 by Lake Pleasant. Mr. Anderson replied that this is an expansion of that roadway for a divided facility in the future. ADOT has done an access control plan, so as development occurs they can protect access. Mayor Hawker asked for clarification of Loop 303 right-of-way. Mr. Anderson stated that there are two elements on Loop 303—one is a new extension south of SR 85 to Riggs Road. Another section is being analyzed now up New River Road. Mr. Anderson referred to its description on page two, line 21 in the document. The motion includes right-of-way protection for the Loop 303 segment south of MC 85.

Mayor Hawker asked if the 303 dead ends at the Gila River Indian Community as it goes south. Mr. Anderson replied that the limits of the study are SR 85 to Riggs Road. The Gila River Indian Community is south of that. Mayor Hawker asked if 238 ties into that? Mr. Anderson replied that the MCDOT study stops at Riggs Road, however, the next stage could extend it to 238.

Chairman Giuliano stated that if one were supportive of adding in the projects requested by the East Valley, and heard that other projects might be added, those who might not want to consider everything to ask themselves if what they want is still included in the motion. What is being discussed is probably less than one percent of the overall plan. Chairman Giuliano expressed his hope that all would consider the motion, as we need to show consensus to our voters. He added that he hoped that no one would allow additional projects of less than one percent of the overall plan be the reason to not support advancing the plan. Chairman Giuliano commented that we do have the capacity, and have contingency upon contingency built into the plan. He advised the he would support the substitute motion.

Mr. Kane added that discussion on firewalls has not yet taken plan. He noted that, for this reason, he did not include firewalls in his substitute motion. Mr. Kane stated that he would not support any plan moving forward that did not have firewalls.

Mayor Hawker acknowledged that Mr. Anderson's explanation on the right-of-way satisfied his questions. He commented that he always supports preserving future right-of-way, otherwise there are major costs later on. Mayor Hawker stated that he supported the original and substitute motions.

Mayor Dunn stated his agreement with Mr. Shultz's comments about focusing on a regional program. He said to the West Valley mayors, that even though the East Valley brought forward a number of projects to balance the regional program, from his perspective, a lot of compromises have been made. Mayor Dunn stated that he feels that the overall plan should have included more mass transit. He added for the record, that even though additional projects were brought forward, there were a lot they compromised on, realizing that a regional approach was needed.

Hearing no further discussion on the motion, Chairman Giuliano called for a vote on the substitute motion, which passed unanimously. He asked if there were other items to address.

Mayor McDermott referred to the Wickenburg requests on page 23. He stated that he was not here to ask for additional projects, just to make a statement. Mayor McDermott stated that he was happy with the motion that was just passed. He expressed his thanks to Chairman Giuliano. When the TPC was formed, he was anxious to serve because of his experience and the importance of having a balanced transportation system. Mayor McDermott stated that he was also interested in serving because he was the only rural member. He stated that it is difficult to believe that Maricopa County west of the 303 does not exist in the final plan. The plan shows a line for the CANAMEX corridor, but no money for a study, right-of-way, or construction. Mayor McDermott urged preservation of right-of-way north of I-10 after

federal approval of the corridor. He stated that CANAMEX will happen and will be of great importance. Mayor McDermott noted that greater than 60 percent of Maricopa County is west of Loop 303. He stated that Maricopa County west of Loop 303 will grow greatly in the next 20 years. Mayor McDermott stated that map A-7 in Scenario B provided major arterials to support that growth; most of those arterials fell off the map. He indicated that he was supportive of the ideas Maricopa County has on that and would like to see more arterials, but is also supportive of the motion today.

No further comments were heard on projects. Discussion continued to the priorities.

Mr. Anderson commented that staff tried to accommodate requests for projects, such as recalculating the financial scenario. However, cash flows are limiting. Mr. Anderson stated that enough cash in each of the phasing periods needed to be ensured.

Mr. Anderson explained that there were two additional requests brought forward. The Loop 202 Dobson to Higley project on page 23 could be accomplished by moving money from the I-10 to Riggs Road expansion project.

Councilmember Dennis stated that the second item was a switch of projects between the City of Peoria and the City of El Mirage and was agreeable to both. She made a motion that the Beardsley Road project would be moved to Phase 1 and the El Mirage project to Phase 2. In Phase 1, Peoria would get \$13.5 million for Beardsley Road and El Mirage would get \$5 million. In Phase 2, Peoria would get \$6.6 million and El Mirage would get \$13 million. Vice Mayor Schweiker seconded.

Mayor Hawker asked for clarification that the revenue still balanced out. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct. Mr. Smith asked for clarification that the motion included the Gilbert project on page 23, as Mr. Anderson mentioned. Councilmember Dennis, as maker of the motion, agreed that the motion would include the Town of Gilbert project as noted on page 23. Vice Mayor Schweiker, as second, agreed. The vote taken on the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Gant made a motion to move the I-10 to Loop 202 to Riggs Road project to Phase 2 from Phase 3; move the widening of HOV and general purpose lanes on I-10 between Phoenix and Tucson to Phase 1. Ms. Scherer seconded.

Mayor Hawker asked the funding source and if there would be any impacts to other projects. Mr. Anderson replied that this project was originally an \$86 million project. ADOT revised cost estimates to \$46 million. Mr. Anderson stated that it would be easier to accommodate in Phase 1 than Phase 2. He stated that the idea was to take the remaining \$40 million and do the HOV to Dobson on the Santan. Chairman Giuliano asked Mr. Anderson if this could be accommodated withing the capacity of Phase 1. Mr. Anderson replied that it could be accommodated.

The vote taken on the motion passed unanimously.

Councilmember Dennis stated that at the September 3rd workshop she had requested the Happy Valley Road project be moved to Phase 2 from Phase 4. She noted that there is no east/west corridor in the Northwest section. Councilmember Dennis made a motion to move the Happy Valley project from Phase 2 to Phase 4. Vice Chair Scruggs seconded.

Chairman Giuliano asked the financing implications. Mr. Smith responded that there are limited funds available for arterials, and making changes is difficult. He added that the loan acceleration policy will be addressed later in the meeting that will allow cities to advance a project. Mr. Anderson stated that the Happy Valley Road project is unlike Beardsley/El Mirage because the phasing change switched funds. He stated that staff would need to re-examine this project and he was unsure the request could be accommodated. Mr. Anderson noted that arterials are programmed very tightly.

Councilmember Dennis expressed concern that she had this on the books for a long time and the projects moved forward earlier in the meeting added \$200 million in arterials. Mr. Anderson stated that staff would look at the arterials cash flows. As the contingencies are reduced, the cash will show up on each of the phases. Mr. Anderson added \$100 million in right-of-way preservation needs to be added to earlier phases, or we lose the opportunity to save money. Mr. Smith noted that because of the air quality conformity analysis, the phasing for actual projects will be locked in. If it is right-of-way, that would not be modeled because there is no traffic on right-of-way. Mr. Smith stated that the priorities need to be established today in order to do the air quality work.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked if there was any advantage to putting Happy Valley Road into this process to determine the contingency process. Mr. Anderson commented that all street projects are critical and everyone would like them to be in Phase 1. He stated that staff will need to re-examine the cash flows. Mr. Anderson explained that staff attempted to prioritize \$600 million spread across four phases. Staff used the same basis--current, 2015 and 2025 volumes to see how the projects would fit in. Not just put them at the back of the line.

Chairman Giuliano asked if it would be fair to say that right-of-way acquisition for SR 74 and Loop 303 would be across all four phases? Mr. Anderson replied that in terms of right-of-way, because we are dealing with ADOT money, we have more cash flow options and additional financing techniques that might be used. Chairman Giuliano commented that there was already an idea of how the East Valley projects that were added fit into the phasing, but for SR 74, Loop 303, and the traffic interchanges, they could be accommodated into phasing because there are higher cash balances in general. Mr. Anderson confirmed that statement.

Councilmember Dennis amended her motion that if sufficient money is available in contingency, consider moving the Happy Valley Road project from Phase 4 to Phase 2. Vice Chair Scruggs, as second, agreed with the amended motion.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that if there is a different amount of money, would it be prudent to take the entire number of arterial projects and model them to see where they come out and if they meet the criteria. She noted that contingency would be a different source of money. Mr. Anderson replied that staff had already looked at arterial projects in the context of other arterials and slotted them in appropriately. He added that there may be an opportunity to make minor changes between now and the Regional Council meeting.

Mayor Hawker commented that if you have a project that has been pegged in, the key to this is you will have to buy down with the process that will be decided later.

Ms. Scherer stated that any city should be able to advance their project if they wanted to fund it in an earlier phase. She added that she would be willing to make a substitute motion to that effect. Chairman

Giuliano noted that capability is already within the MAG policies. He called for discussion on the motion.

Mayor Manross commented that the phasing is very sensitive, and tinkering with that could be opening up a pandora's box. She stated that she would support the ability to accelerate projects. All communities will need to do that, but the phasing should be left as is.

Councilmember Dennis withdrew her motion.

Mr. Gant commented that there are two intersections on the HOV system on Loop 202 to the Santan and the Santan to Loop 101/Price Road. He explained that there would be no traffic interchanges for the HOV lanes and it would be more efficient if construction took place concurrently. He made a motion to change the HOV interchanges on Loop 202 to the Santan to Phase 2 from Phase 3, and change the HOV interchanges on the Santan to Loop 101/Price Road to Phase 3 from Phase 4. Mayor Hawker seconded.

Mayor Thomas commented that reconstruction costs could be saved by moving up the projects.

Chairman Giuliano asked if there were financing implications. Mr. Smith stated that the Life Cycle Program considers advancement of projects by ADOT. If the cash is there, the projects could be accommodated.

A vote was taken on the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mayor Thomas moved to phase those projects that were approved tonight, excluding right-of-way acquisition, in Phase 4 and revisit every five years. Councilmember Dennis seconded.

Mr. Kane stated that when setting a contingency only to consider and prioritize those projects added tonight occurring in the end is not something he would support. Project prioritization was short before and would be impacted by this motion.

Mr. Shultz stated that everyone needs to keep thinking about the regional nature of the plan and interrelationships of projects. It is a natural progression based on population projections and needs. To arbitrarily put all in Phase 4 would compromise the regional nature of the plan. Mr. Shultz commented that he understood the feeling of fiscal responsibility, but would not be able to support the motion.

Mayor Thomas commented that the purpose of the motion was to have this discussion with the caveat is when we do a revision every five years that would give us the opportunity to incorporate money saved through the process. Mayor Thomas withdrew his motion.

Hearing no further phasing issues, Chairman Giuliano proceeded to policy concepts for consideration. The concepts include: 1) That funding firewalls be established for the following modes of transportation: freeways, streets and transit, with the understanding that these firewalls represent the percentage of funding identified in the plan and that the funds from the sales tax be deposited in their respective accounts (Regional Area Road Fund for freeways, a sub-account of the RARF for streets and the Public Transportation Fund for transit). Increases or decreases in sales tax revenue would be reflected proportionately in the respective accounts. 2) That the Arizona Department of Transportation develop a Life Cycle Certification Program for freeways and streets and the Regional Public

Transportation Authority develop a Life Cycle Certification Program for transit to ensure that costs and revenues for the Regional Transportation Plan are balanced annually. 3) That freeway and street project accelerations be considered, with the existing highway acceleration policy used as a model for consideration. 4) That the material cost change and enhancement policies now used for the freeway program be expanded to transportation projects funded by the sales tax as prescribed by state law. 5) That funding for rubberized asphalt/noise mitigation in the amount of \$75 million be included in the plan and be provided from the funding for maintenance. 6) That every five years, the Regional Transportation Plan be re-evaluated to consider major plan adjustments resulting from new information or studies pertaining to the implementation of the Plan. 7) That the Regional Transportation Plan consider the input from the public and member agencies, with the additional amount needed for these projects being provided by using a proportionate share of the contingency/set aside funds. 8) Advance to Valley Metro the concept of free fares for youth.

Mr. Shultz suggested that action on the policy concepts be taken in one motion. He stated that this is not to minimize the concepts, but the TPC has vetted these concepts during their year-long process.

Chairman Giuliano asked for a sense of the body in moving in that direction.

Mayor Dunn suggested that if a member had an issue with any of the concepts to identify their concern, which could then be discussed. He noted that these are all good policies.

Supervisor Stapley stated that he liked the idea of a single vote on all of the concepts, but the Board of Supervisors spent a lot of time on developing their proposed accountability provisions and would like them discussed.

Chairman Giuliano asked the County to present their comments. Tom Buick, County Transportation Director, stated that the County followed the requirements of HB 2292 in providing their written comments. He commented that in the interest of moving forward, the County would like to focus attention on ensuring the plan is accountable to voters. Mr. Buick reviewed the County's proposed accountability provisions, a copy of which was provided to members. 1) Require an independent evaluation of the performance of the RTP every five years. (Full audit of implemented projects and evaluation of projects within the balance of the plan time frame.) 2) The TPC must review the independent RTP evaluation and may recommend amendments to the RTP based on the independent evaluation. 3) A minor amendment may be made through a two-thirds majority vote by the TPC. (A minor amendment is an adjustment that does not change the overall modal funding percentages in the RTP.) 4) A major amendment to the RTP must be approved by a majority vote of the TPC and a majority vote of the citizens of Maricopa County. (A major amendment includes any of the following: the addition or deletion of a freeway, expressway, or high capacity transit project; or any other adjustment that would change the overall modal funding percentages in the RTP.) The TPC, on approval of a major amendment, shall request the County Board of Supervisors to call for an election, on the next general election date, to consider the amendment. 5) In no case may an amendment change the regional funding percentages in the RTP. 6) Include the above accountability provisions in the authorizing legislation. Supervisor Stapley commented that the Board unanimously recommended these provisions and make their approval of the plan contingent upon this sort of check and balance.

Supervisor Stapley moved to approve the eight policy concepts, that included advancing to Valley Metro the concept of free fares for youth. Mr. Berry seconded.

Mr. Kane stated that the County's proposal to add provisions that require accountability is rational. He commented that it is a long plan and many things can happen. Mr. Kane expressed that he was troubled by the public vote provision for major amendments. He suggested an option for discussion--that major amendments be approved by a super-majority of the Board of Supervisors, the TPC, and the ADOT Board. Mr. Kane stated that this would provide an appropriate check and balance without going to the expense and difficulty of a public vote. He mentioned his concern that there might not be a right to call for a public vote. Chairman Giuliano noted that there may also be federal law considerations.

Mayor Manross stated that the #4 provision could result in unintended consequences. Among the unknown factors is who would allow us to go to an election. Mayor Manross stated that she agreed with the sunset provision and to make modifications as necessary.

Mayor Hawker stated that he agreed with provision #1. Even though the life cycle program is in place, a major reexamination is needed every five years. He stated that #3 needed clarification because the amendment would still need to go to the Regional Council. Mayor Hawker stated that clarification of funding percentages is needed in #5. He stated that the provision does not explain if the percentages are by city, by mode, etc.

Supervisor Stapley stated that the intent was to have firewalls apply to both regional equity, as well as mode.

Mayor Hawker stated that hypothetically, if the 20-mile starter segment of the light rail system did not perform as expected, would those geographic areas that had the light rail get the money for their other transit projects, or would the money be redistributed throughout the region? Supervisor Stapley replied that the money would stay in the subregion.

Mayor Cavanaugh stated that 10 to 15 years from now, people might be better able to determine whether a requirement may be beneficial than the requirement from which it was removed. He stated that he would not want to remove that capability. Mayor Cavanaugh stated that he supported the concept of firewalls, but two areas of uncertainty are the I-17 design and light rail. Both are huge consumers of funds. If either fails and is replaced by a substitute project, the amount would probably be markedly less. Mayor Cavanaugh stated that keeping this movement restricted might not be desirable for the entire region. He stated that there needs to be a way for those in the future to decide. Mayor Cavanaugh stated that he was not opposed to firewalls, but was opposed if a significant change occurs in the transportation scenario as it is envisioned today.

Mr. Smith commended the County for bringing forward their provisions. He noted that provision #1 is similar to the performance audit, which saved us in 1991, and whose recommendations resulted in HB 2278. This kept the program on budget and on time. Mr. Smith urged support of this provision by the TPC. He expressed his agreement with provision #2. Mr. Smith referred to Mayor Hawker's comments on provision #3, that the TPC makes recommendations to the Regional Council, who is the final body to approve amendments to the plan. Mr. Smith commented that the TPC would need to debate major and minor amendments and this could take place at a future meeting. He mentioned that the amendments should be those related to the sales tax funds. Once you insert ADOT funds and other funds, this could be problematic.

Mr. Anderson stated on clauses that say overall modal funding percentages in the RTP, including federal highway money, federal transit money, and HURF that can only be spent on highways and roads. He

explained that HURF is set by a formula in statute. If HURF goes up or down, then with the firewalls concept, the freeway program would have to live within that. Mr. Anderson stated that the percentages will change because of the different sources. He added that the MAG would control the allocation of percentages of the sales tax, however. Mr. Anderson stated that the TPC needs to consider the minor/major amendment language. The concept can work, but the definitions need to be hammered out.

Councilmember Bilsten asked for clarification of the County's role in the process. She asked if they disagree on the provisions, does that affect the ballot going to the voters. Mr. Smith stated that in HB 2292, a cooperatively developed plan with RPTA and ADOT is required. Federal guidelines require consultation with local governments, including the County. Mr. Smith explained that HB 2292 requires the County to provide comments on the plan in writing. Councilmember Bilsten asked for clarification if the motion failed that would not affect the overall unanimous vote? Mr. Smith replied that was correct.

Chairman Giuliano stated that there seemed to be consensus on provisions #1, #2, and #6, and that further discussion was needed on #3, #4, and #5.

Mr. Shultz asked if Supervisor Stapley, as maker of the motion, if he would be willing to embrace #1, #2, and #6, and the others would be developed in the future, consistent with testimony today?

Supervisor Stapley commented that he wanted the TPC to understand that the Board worked hard on these provisions. He noted there was a difference in opinion on the Board about the major amendments going to a public vote. Supervisor Stapley stated that he would be willing to move the process forward by amending his motion to approve the County's provisions #1, #2, and #6 with the understanding that dialogue will continue on the other provisions. He noted that he understood this has to go to the Regional Council because of federal requirements. Supervisor Stapley stated that he was open to ways other than a public vote because of the cost, perhaps a super majority of the three agencies.

Mr. Shultz offered a comment on firewalls. He stated that it is extremely important to reiterate that firewalls means when we voted on elements of the plan and modal splits, it is saying to voters this the plan and it needs to be as specific as practical at this stage. That is what firewalls will do. That is what the County did and adds additional credibility to the evolution of dollars and the validity of projects. Mr. Shultz stated that he supported the motion.

Mr. Berry asked if final legislation would include the details of #3, #4, and #5 when the details are worked out. Chairman Giuliano replied that #1, #2, and #6 would be included. but it was uncertain whether there would be sufficient time to include #3, #4, and #5 in legislation because the details need to be worked out.

Supervisor Stapley commented that they need to be in the legislation, otherwise, there will be no credibility. Mr. Berry commented that he thought there would be sufficient time to work out the details.

Mayor Dunn commented on provision #5. He stated that the issue of regional equity is based on projects outside a city's borders, but still affects that area's citizens, for example, the South Mountain freeway. Mayor Dunn stated that if funding for that freeway went away, that would be a large chunk of funds that citizens were counting on to receive. It is a good concept in that it ensures citizens where the percentages were based. The TPC could say additional projects will be brought to that community.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated her support for the motion, but was hearing that a process might be developed that might include some aspects she opposed. She stated that putting a major amendment to the vote of citizens is unreasonable and unrealistic, and would slow down the process. In addition, we do not know if we have the authority to call an election. She stated that once you try to lock in regional funding percentages by cities, it will cause problems. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that if a process is developed that includes these two items, she would vote against.

Supervisor Stapley stated that the intent of the motion is to leave provisions #3, #4, and #5 for a future date. Agree they are very important, but they are yet to be determined.

Mayor Thomas expressed his agreement with Vice Chair Scruggs. Having an election would be very time consuming. In addition, the way the provision is written, the TPC would be back to square one, having to go to the County and get permission for a vote.

Supervisor Stapley commented that the idea of provision #6 is that authority would be written into legislation that the County Board shall call for an election.

Vice Mayor Schweiker expressed his support for provisions #1, #2, and #6. He felt the other details could be worked out satisfactorily at a future date.

Chairman Giuliano reread the motion: To advance provisions #1, #2, and #6 and instruct staff to set up meetings to work on other issues, such as minor/major amendments.

Mr. Smith asked for clarification if the motion included the eight policy concepts. Supervisor Stapley replied that his amended motion included just the County provisions.

Chairman Giuliano read the policy concepts: 1) That funding firewalls be established for the following modes of transportation: freeways, streets and transit, with the understanding that these firewalls represent the percentage of funding identified in the plan and that the funds from the sales tax be deposited in their respective accounts (Regional Area Road Fund for freeways, a sub-account of the RARF for streets and the Public Transportation Fund for transit). Increases or decreases in sales tax revenue would be reflected proportionately in the respective accounts. 2) That the Arizona Department of Transportation develop a Life Cycle Certification Program for freeways and streets and the Regional Public Transportation Authority develop a Life Cycle Certification Program for transit to ensure that costs and revenues for the Regional Transportation Plan are balanced annually. 3) That freeway and street project accelerations be considered, with the existing highway acceleration policy used as a model for consideration. 4) That the material cost change and enhancement policies now used for the freeway program be expanded to transportation projects funded by the sales tax as prescribed by state law. 5) That funding for rubberized asphalt/noise mitigation in the amount of \$75 million be included in the plan and be provided from the funding for maintenance. 6) That every five years, the Regional Transportation Plan be re-evaluated to consider major plan adjustments resulting from new information or studies pertaining to the implementation of the Plan. 7) That the Regional Transportation Plan consider the input from the public and member agencies, with the additional amount needed for these projects being provided by using a proportionate share of the contingency/set aside funds. 8) Advance to Valley Metro the concept of free fares for youth.

Mr. Shultz moved to approve the policy concepts. Mayor Dunn seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Giuliano stated that the TPC had approved the projects, prioritization, and policies. He requested a motion that would acknowledge the approval of the entire Plan that incorporates action taken on the projects, prioritization, and policies.

Mayor Dunn moved to approve the Plan, incorporating the action taken by the TPC on the projects, prioritization, and policies, and to direct staff to provide to each entity that has submitted a proposed plan modification, within thirty days of this date, a written response, based on the discussions and vote on the plan modifications this date, explaining the affirmation, rejection or further modification of the entity's proposed Plan modification. Mr. Shultz seconded.

Before a vote was taken, Mr. Smith commented that to comply with HB 2292, those projects not approved or further modified would be deemed disapproved.

A vote taken on the motion passed unanimously.

6. Recommendation of Final Draft Stage of Regional Transportation Plan for an Air Quality Conformity Analysis

At the July 22, 2003 meeting of the TPC, the TPC recommended a Final Draft Stage of the Regional Transportation Plan for transportation modeling. The results of this modeling were sent to the member agencies for review and to the public to solicit comments on the Plan. Since the July 22, 2003 meeting, the Arizona Department of Transportation provided refined cost estimates for the Draft Plan, resulting in an additional \$450 million. Staff reviewed the revenue estimates, and due to the FY 2026 year being inadvertently omitted, and an error in the Surface Transportation Program funds calculation, the revenue has been increased by \$433 million. These cost and revenue adjustments indicate a positive revenue balance of \$94 million. On September 3, 2003, a priority workshop was held to receive input on the proposed priorities. This input has been considered in the priorities being proposed for the Plan. Input from the public and projects submitted by member agencies will be considered in the final recommendation to approve the Plan. Please refer to the enclosed material.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Ms. White, who stated that from what she just saw, the firewalls concept is fine as long as it is not enforced. She commented that there is no enforcement mechanism. Ms. White stated that the black hole will be I-17 and light rail. Light rail will not return money back to the system. What happened in other cities is that light rail stole money from buses, then the other transportation modes. Ms. White stated that this will happen and firewalls have no meaning. She asked if members had any idea how easy this will be to defeat? Ms. White stated that they defeated MAG in 1994 when people were desperate for freeways. She stated that this is a bad plan, put together badly. Ms. White stated that she is big proponent of freeways. She stated that cities have given local control of arterials to MAG and will have to crawl on broken glass to MAG to get money, which will go to the black hole. Ms. White commented on Mr. Smith's comment that the audit was one of the best things that ever happened. The audit was a result of activists battling for it at the legislature, and they have never received a thank you note. Chairman Giuliano thanked Ms. White for her comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley, who expressed thanks for the air quality the TPC did today. Mr. Crowley recommended that the TPC vote to have a five year review of the Plan. He stated that the biggest harm to air quality is freeways and congestion. As soon as a freeway is built, there is congestion. Mr. Crowley stated that the TPC says it wants to ensure there are firewalls, but the problem is that arterials are not being done right to begin with. Air quality is a part

of the equation for it to be done right. Mr. Crowley stated that he did not see heavy rail as part of the equation. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano expressed his thanks to Mr. Smith and Mr. Anderson and staff for the hard work over the past year. He stated that they are true professionals. Chairman Giuliano stated that the TPC will be advancing the Plan for an air quality conformity analysis that meets two overriding needs—it is within our capacity and meets the varied needs of residents over the next 20 years.

Mayor Manross moved to recommend approval of the Regional Transportation Plan for an air quality conformity analysis. She expressed her congratulations for overcoming the many obstacles in the past year. She stated that the Regional Transportation Plan is a good sign for the future. Mayor Thomas seconded.

Mayor Dunn expressed his thanks on behalf of the TPC to Chairman Giuliano for his encouragement and ability to bring parties together so that the TPC could arrive at a unanimous vote. That we have a detailed Plan and approved it unanimously is a credit to Chairman Giuliano's leadership.

The vote taken on the motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary